



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,594	09/05/2003	Radislav A. Potyrailo	RD-28750-1	7960
6147	7590	03/23/2007	EXAMINER	
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY GLOBAL RESEARCH PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59 NISKAYUNA, NY 12309			NAGPAUL, JYOTI	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		1743
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/23/2007	PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/656,594	POTYRAILO ET AL.
	Examiner Jyoti Nagpaul	Art Unit 1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 29-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-15, drawn to a system for creating a combinatorial coating sensor library, classified in class 422, subclass 99.
  - II. Claims 16-28, drawn to a method for creating a sensor array, classified in class 436, subclass 180.
  - III. Claims 29-41, drawn to a sensor, classified in class 422, subclass 100.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method can be used on a entirely different apparatus. For example, an apparatus that does not require a delivery mechanism or a controller.
3. Inventions I and III are directed to related manufacturing and evaluating sensor coatings. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are distinct in that Group I requires the particulars of a delivery mechanism and a controller whereas

Group III is directed to a sensor. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

4. Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method can be performed with an entirely different apparatus. For example, the claimed method as requires delivering a plurality of organic reactants to a substrate.

5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. During a telephone conversation with Shawn McClintic on March 14, 2007 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group III, claim 29-41. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-28 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Claim Objections***

8. Claims 33-36 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. In this case, Claim 35 recites, "the first segment is a polyimide and the second segment is a polysiloxane" whereas Claim 33 recites multiple first segment organic polymers including a polyimide and Claim 34 recites multiple second segment organic polymers including a polysiloxane. It appears, Claims 35-36 should be dependent from Claims 33 and 34 to properly further limit the claimed subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 36 recites the limitation "the polyimide" in Line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. **Claims 29-41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger in view of Grate, Abraham and McGill (Submission by Applicant).

Berger teaches protective coatings for semiconductors and other electronic devices. The coating has a thickness of about 0.1 nanometers to about 100 micrometers. (See Col. 62, Lines 40-44) Additionally, Berger teaches the coating comprises at least a first segment and a second segment. The first segment is a polyimide and the second segment is a polysiloxane. (See various examples and Col. 39, Lines 50-60) Berger further teaches polyimide is formed by the reaction of a dianhydride with a diamine. (See Col. 14, Lines 50-51) With respect to Claims 37-40, it is inherent that Berger teaches dianhydride and diamine having the various structure formulas as claimed because of the formation of polyimide is present in the teachings of Berger. With respect to Claim 32, Berger teaches polyimides containing the siloxane unit can be processed quite readily since they have much lower glass transition temperature. Specifically, Berger discloses the glass transition temperature being on the order of 140 degrees Celsius so they will melt and flow more readily. (See Col. 29, Lines 50-60)

Berger fails to explicitly teach the coating has a partition coefficient of greater than or equal to about  $10^5$  towards at least one analyte. Berger also fails to explicitly teach the first segment has a glass transition greater than or equal to about 23 degrees Celsius and the second segment has a glass transition temperature of less than 23 degrees Celsius.

Grate, Abraham and McGill teaches partition coefficients of thin films for use in electronic devices. Partition coefficients are a function of concentrations of vapor in the sorbent and gas or vapor phase. (See pgs 595-601)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of to provide the coating of Berger having a partition coefficient of or equal to about  $10^5$  towards at least one analyte in order to increase absorption of the analyte of interest as disclosed in Grate, Abraham and McGill.

With regards to the teachings on glass transition temperatures as disclosed above in Berger, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of to provide the first segment/polyimide has a glass transition greater than or equal to about 23 degrees Celsius and the second segment/siloxane has a glass transition temperature of less than 23 degrees Celsius in order to facilitate processing and fabrication of high molecular weight materials and increase permeability to gases as disclosed in Berger. (See Col. 14, Lines 23-34)

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jyoti Nagpaul whose telephone number is 571-272-1273. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JN

  
Jill Warden  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700